APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,629	12/17/2003	Avery Fong	246161US2CONT	4751

22850   7590   08/13/2007
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
TSUI, WILSON W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/13/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	10/736,629	FONG ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Wilson Tsui	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 May 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *17 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the RCE filed on: 05/18/2007.

2.   Claims 1-4, 9-12, and 17-20 are amended. Claims 28-30 are new. Thus, claims

1-30 are pending.

3.   Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-15, 17-19, 21-23, remain rejected and claims 28-30 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rada et al, claims 4, 8, 12, 16,

20, and 24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rada et

al, in further view of Burnard, Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Rada et al, and Burnard, in further view of Linden.

Drawings

4.   The drawings filed on: 12/17/2003 are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   Claims 2-4, 10-12, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph,

as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With regards to claim 2, which depends on claim 1, the claimed "the document" is

unclear, since there are two documents (a first document, and a second document)

mentioned in the independent claim, for which claim 2, depends on. The examiner is

going to assume that the claimed "the document" in claim 2 refers to the first document

in claim 1).

With regards to claim 3, which depends on claim 1, the claimed "the document" is unclear, since there are two documents (a first document, and a second document) mentioned in the independent claim, for which claim 3, depends on. The examiner is going to assume that the claimed "the document" in claim 3 refers to the first document in claim 1).

With regards to claim 4, which depends on claim 1, the claimed "the document" is unclear, since there are two documents (a first document, and a second document) mentioned in the independent claim, for which claim 4, depends on. The examiner is going to assume that the claimed "the document" in claim 4 refers to the first document in claim 1).

With regards to claim 10, which depends on claim 9, the claimed "the document" is unclear, since there are two documents (a first document, and a second document) mentioned in the independent claim, for which claim 10, depends on. The examiner is going to assume that the claimed "the document" in claim 10 refers to the first document in claim 9).

With regards to claim 11, which depends on claim 9, the claimed "the document" is unclear, since there are two documents (a first document, and a second document) mentioned in the independent claim, for which claim 11, depends on. The examiner is going to assume that the claimed "the document" in claim 11 refers to the first document in claim 9).

With regards to claim 12, which depends on claim 9, the claimed "the document" is unclear, since there are two documents (a first document, and a second document)

mentioned in the independent claim, for which claim 12, depends on. The examiner is going to assume that the claimed "the document" in claim 12 refers to the first document in claim 9).

With regards to claim 18, which depends on claim 17, the claimed "the document" is unclear, since there are two documents (a first document, and a second document) mentioned in the independent claim, for which claim 18, depends on. The examiner is going to assume that the claimed "the document" in claim 18 refers to the first document in claim 17).

With regards to claim 19, which depends on claim 17, the claimed "the document" is unclear, since there are two documents (a first document, and a second document) mentioned in the independent claim, for which claim 19, depends on. The examiner is going to assume that the claimed "the document" in claim 19 refers to the first document in claim 17).

With regards to claim 20, which depends on claim 17, the claimed "the document" is unclear, since there are two documents (a first document, and a second document) mentioned in the independent claim, for which claim 20, depends on. The examiner is going to assume that the claimed "the document" in claim 20 refers to the first document in claim 17).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6.   Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-15, 17-19, 21-23, remain rejected and claims 28-30 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rada et al ("Hypertext

Interchange Using ICA", published: June 1995, pages 99-117).

With regards to claim 1. Rada et al teaches a method of transforming information,

comprising:

- *Inputting, into an editor, a first structural description of a first structured format:* (page 100: whereas, the original data representation/first-structural-description is specified)

- *Inputting, into the editor, a second structural description of a second structured format; inputting, into the editor by a user, preferences for transforming an element of the first structural description to at least one element of the second structural description* (pages 100 and 101: whereas, the intermediate format/second-structural description is also specified, and preferences for transforming an element of the first structural description to at least one element of the second structural description are also entered using the recoding and structural mapping toolset);

- *Storing translation information output from the editor, the translation information comprising at least the preferences input by the user* (page 101: whereas, the translation information is stored in a recoded file);

- *transforming a first document or database structure provided in the first structured format into a second document or database structure in the second*

structured format based on the translation information (Figure 1, page 101:

whereas, using the recoded file/document, the first structured

format/specific/original data representation is converted to the

second/general/intermediate/document structure representation using the

Specific to General tool.

With regards to claim 2, which depends on claim 1, wherein the transforming includes

transforming the document and the first structured format has a Document Type

Definition (DTD) directed hierarchy (page 102: whereas, the first structured format, can

be SGML (which includes a DTD), such that the second format will by a structural

format for a hypertext system).

With regards to claim 3, which depends on claim 1, wherein the transforming includes

transforming the document and said first structured format is derived from Standard

Generalized Markup Language (SGML), as similarly explained in the rejection for claim

2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 5, which depends on claim 3, wherein the second structured

format is a Document Type Definition (DTD) directed hierarchy (page 102: whereas, the

second structured format, can be the open and interchange layer, and the first

structured format can be the text markup language, such that the second structured

format is SGML (which includes a DTD)).

With regards to claim 6, which depends on claim 3, further comprising: outputting, from

the editor to a graphical user interface, a representation of a translation between the

first structured format and the second structured format (page 114: whereas, a

representation of a translation (translation from 'MUCH' to 'Guide') is shown/presented on a computer screen).

With regards to claim 7, which depends on claim 3, wherein *the second structured format is derived from Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML)*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 5, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 1, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 10, which depends on claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 2, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 11, which depends on claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 3, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 13. which depends on claim 11, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 5, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 14. which depends on claim 11, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 6, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 15, which depends on claim 11, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 7, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 17, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 1, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 18, which depends on claim 17, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 2, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 19, which depends on claim 17, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 3, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 21, which depends on claim 19, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 5, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 22, which depends on claim 19, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 6, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 23, which depends on claim 19, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 7, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 28, which depends on claim 1, Rada teaches *generating translation information based on database design information, document type and a document* (page 101: whereas, "more than one set of data translators are generated ... to form a converter from one markup language to another". Additionally, the generation of translation information is based upon database design information (page 100: whereas, specified through a grammar developer), document type and a document (page 100: whereas, original presentation/document type is detected, and the markup data in the original presentation is used.)

With regards to claim 29, which depends on claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 28, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 30, which depends on claim 17, for a computer-readable medium

encoded with instructions, which perform a method similar to the method of claim 28, is

rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, and 24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Rada et al ("Hypertext Interchange Using ICA", published: June

1995, pages 99-117), in further view of Burnard ("SGML on the Web: too little too soon,

or too much too late?", published: November 1, pages 1-9).

With regards to claim 4, which depends on claim 3, RADA teaches *wherein the*

transforming includes transforming the document and said first structured format, as

similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

However, Rada does not expressly teach the first structured format is *eXstensible*

Markup Language (XML).

Burnard teaches a structured format is *eXstensible Markup Language (XML)*: whereas,

"XML is used as a leaner and simpler subset of the SGML metalanguage" (p8-1)

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to have modified Rada's first structured format to have been the structured

format of XML, as taught by Burnard. The combination of Rada and Burnard would have

allowed Rada to have "been able to support a wide variety of applications, and with a concise formal design" (Rada, p8-1).

With regards to claim 8, which depends on claim 7, RADA teaches *said second structured format*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Rada does not expressly teach the second structured format is *eXstensible Markup Language (XML)*.

Burnard teaches a structured format is *eXstensible Markup Language (XML)*: whereas, "XML is used as a leaner and simpler subset of the SGML metalanguage" (p8-1) It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Rada's second structured format to have been the structured format of XML, as taught by Burnard. The combination of Rada and Burnard would have allowed Rada to have "been able to support a wide variety of applications, and with a concise formal design" (Rada, p8-1).

With regards to claim 12, which depends on claim 11, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 4, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 16, which depends on claim 15, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 8, is rejected under the same rationale

With regards to claim 20, which depends on claim 19, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 4, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 24, which depends on claim 23, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 8, is rejected under the same rationale.

8.   Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rada et al ("Hypertext Interchange Using ICA", published: June 1995, pages 99-117), and Burnard ("SGML on the Web: too little too soon, or too much too late?", published: November 1, pages 1-9), in further view of Linden ("Structured Document Transformations", published: June 1997, pages: NP-1, NP-48, NP-49, NP-50, NP-53). With regards to claim 25,which depends on claim 1, Rada teaches *wherein the preferences for transforming*, as similarly explained by the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale. However, Rada does not expressly teach the preferences for transforming *include a user selection of which elements of the first structured format to map to the second structured format.*

Linden teaches the preferences for transforming *include a user selection of which elements of the first structured format to map to the second structured format* (NP-49, NP-50, and NP-53: whereas, a user selects elements of a first/source format to map to a second/target format through the use of a graphical tool, such as the mapper tool of Figure 4.7).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Rada's user preferences, such that they further included preferences for transforming through a user selection, as taught by Linden. The combination of Rada and Linden would have allowed Rada to have allowed the user to

have made "symbol associations by selecting source and target symbols" (Linden, NP-

50).

With regards to claim 26, which depends on claim 9, for a system performing a method

similar to the method performed in claim 25, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 27, which depends on claim 17, for a computer readable medium

encoded with instructions which perform a method similar to the method performed in

claim 27, is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

9.   Applicant's arguments filed 05/18/2007 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

10.   With regards to claim 1, the applicant first argues that Rada addresses the

problem of hypertext mapping, which is different from structure mapping, and that none

of the sections in Rada discuss mapping the structure (page 9 of applicant's remarks),

Rather, Rada concentrates on the treatment of the hyperlink in mapping one system to

another. Yet, the applicant's argument is not persuasive, since as explained in page 99

of Rada, Rada teaches converting one data format to another data format in order to

support hypertext markup languages [with] non-linear structures (as explained in page

100). Therefore, hypertext has structure, and the hypertext mapping performed by

Rada, includes mapping structured data. Furthermore, as explained at the end of page

101 of Rada, and the beginning of page 102 of Rada; 'the data representation from the

translation is specified must be: ... represented by a descriptive representation with a

structure. Thus, the mapping/translation performed by Rada, requires the use of

structure data to map to individual formats (whereas the format/specific-markup is structured data, as explained above). Additionally, the applicant's fails to provide support/evidence that Rada teaches 'the treatment of hyperlink in mapping one system to another'. Assuming arguendo, the examiner will make an assumption that the applicant might be referring to the SGML-Dexter model, with regards to hyperlink mapping (page 102). Yet, as explained in the last paragraph of page 102, the Dexter model implements a 'Storage layer [which] models the basic node/link network *structure*'. Thus, mapping of structured data is implemented, and Rada's invention does not 'just treat hyperlinks and stylesheets' (without disregard to structured data), but rather takes into account the mapping of structured data, as explained above; and thus the applicant's argument is not persuasive.

11. With regards to claims 2-16, 25, and 28 being allowable, since they depend directly or indirectly upon claim 1, is not persuasive, since claim 1 has been shown/explained to be rejected.

12. In addition, with regards to claims 9 and 17, for reciting elements analogous to those of claim 1, and thus are allowable, is not persuasive since claim 1 has been shown/explained to be rejected.

13. With regards to claims 10-16, 18-27, 29, and 30, for being allowable since they depend either directly or indirectly upon claims 9 and 17, is not persuasive since claims 9 and 17 have been shown/explained to be rejected.

Conclusion

14.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Wilson Tsui whose telephone number is (571)272-7596.
The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number
for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a
USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information
system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

W.T. 08/3/07

Wilson Tsui
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2178
Aug 3, 2007

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER